DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 790 TE 500 214

By-Harkness, Bruce
THE CHAIRMAN AND THE DEAN.
Association of Departments of English, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Oct 68
Note-11p.
Journal Cit-ADE Bulletin; n19 p13-23 Oct 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.52
Descriptors-ACADEMIC FREEDOM, ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, *ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITY, *ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, *CHANGING ATTITUDES, *COLLEGE FACULTY, *ENGLISH, HIGHER EDUCATION, LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITY, STUDENT COLLEGE RELATIONSHIP, STUDENT NEEDS

The role of the English chairman and his relations to students, faculty, and administration are discussed. Some of his "overriding" problems are considered, but emphasis is given to future problems which may result from an "administrative-dominated" college. The article concludes that despite the problems and indications of future pressures from society, the "super-board," and the students, the department chairmen will be in a position to make a positive contribution to the educational community. (BN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ADE BULLETIN Number 19 October 1968

The Chairman and the Dean

by Bruce Harkness
Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Kent State University

The day of the happy amateur is over. Even more a dodo is the Benevolent Despot. The Benevolent Despot reigned for thirty years, during the last ten of which the noun disappeared and he was only benevolent--perhaps silly--and not a despot at all. His Department sought graceful methods of replacing him so that something, good or ill, could happen at the college. As for the unbenevolent despot, he is legendary; but I am becoming more and more convinced that, like Piltdown Man, he never really existed.

The happy amateur could exist in small departments only, or in large departments of unusual composition. In the latter there had to be a small group of intellectually strong, well-known, and knowing professors, probably with a unified approach to literature or at least to academic politics. Furthermore, there had to be surrounding them a larger group of professors relatively content to let their brethren run the show by rotating the chairmanship. One- or two-year chairmanships not constructed on absolute smallness or smallness of effective size were not chairmanships of departments but chairmanships of local anarchies.

Nowadays the holder of the chairmanship, whether he be called Head or Chairman, is in a permanent position, heading a group of representative committee structures or, if you prefer, of oligarchies. (Four or five years, by the way, is "permanent" nowadays.) Democracy has invaded the faculty and all faculty members want what they term democratic governance of the college or university. Nonetheless, the last thing they really want is an egalitarian democracy.

In what purports to be a democratic department, lines are unclearly drawn but nevertheless cannot be crossed. Decisive voting power should lie only with those concerned with the issue at hand, though all faculty members should be listened to. Thus we hear that the full professors should have nothing to say about freshman composition, for they haven't taught it in years. Nor should new instructors shape the doctoral program, since they are "not qualified." Let the instructors have a voice, but the voice need not be listened to. The reservation is especially true of the student's voice.

Above all, the faculty wants to get about its main job of teaching and research and not be bothered with details, administration, committee work, or money. Except for the larger issues of policy, all the dirty work should be left to the chairman. When, however, it suits the issue, "democracy" is invoked.

What then is the chairman's role? It can be very simply stated. The chairman should lead while appearing to follow, and follow while appearing to lead. He should consult widely on all major issues and act independently on all minor.

Like all simple statements, this is true. It is also unhelpful.

As a chairman goes about the administrative acts of his department, he can be damned if he does, and damned if he doesn't. He can also bring it off: if he does, he builds a great department. As I've looked at chairmen and at departments I've sometimes felt that in the final analysis the difference may all be luck. What one man does, succeeds brilliantly; if another tries it, he becomes a walking disaster. But we all have to learn, like Lucky Jim Dixon, to bet on our luck, or at least learn <u>when</u> to bet on it. That, I suppose, is why we are gathered here.

ED022790
IE 300 214

In recent weeks I have been rereading the talks which John Gerber and Bob Rogers gave to the ADE at Penn State last year. They were eloquent statements of aims, philosophies, and the purposes of our discipline and its chairmanship. I am the vaudevillian who discovers he must follow Martin and Rowan. After last night's talk and this morning's, I realize that I am also following Chaplin and W.C. Fields--I'll let you sort out which is which. Much of what I shall say amplifies the talks of Rea Keast and Bob Heilman.

Consequently I have tried to shift, tried not to deal with the larger ends of the topic but its day-to-day means. I am more concerned with who's on first than whether it's a brilliant ball game. The last, I regret, must be left to the faculty and the gods anyway. Therefore, please put my factual remarks in this previous philosophical context.

Many of my illustrations and suggestions, together with the cloudy personal background which gives rise to them, will not relate specifically to English. Though that is my own field, and of course the direct concern of this conference, I find I wish to say much about the chairmanship which would apply just as well to, say, Mathematics. I am also aware that many of you have Deans who are from other disciplines, and perhaps in future years you will be addressed by Chemists. I therefore take a middle position and speak as one who, though an English teacher and formerly a chairman, for purposes of this talk is primarily an administrative dean. A good bit of what I shall say relates rather more to the general governance of a liberal arts college than specifically to the English department, its chairman, its faculty, and its student.

In this connection, and as a kind of aside, let me say flat out that the overriding problem I have with departments is to make them realize, and act on the realization, that they are part of a college and a university. Most departments today are tunnel-visioned, though I am proud to say that English is less so than any other. English departments have traditionally been willing to assume their proper role in the college, though it is true that a few Young Turks misguidedly wish to go their own way. But more of that later.

More pragmatic than last year's deanly comments, I hope also that mine will fit into today's program, for you are scheduled this afternoon to discuss case studies of real problems in the management of various sorts of departments.

Let me then outline what at least one administrator hopes for in a department chairman. I think my remarks can be divided into two groups. First, the problems and pains of being a chairman now. Second, these challenges and rewards as I believe they will be shortly. In the very near future new facets will be added to them. I shall sketch, therefore, the main concerns that I see before you and which I think may become the dominant and perhaps exclusive concerns of a chairman within your own span of tenure.

Needless to say, I have a lot of lovely stuff here that I must condense into a fifty minute hour. Bob Heilman expressed most of it last night, more wittily than I. Consequently, I shall abstract into simple precepts the main bits of advice I have to give about the present-day chairmanship.

1. Do not fear being an overly autocratic leader. The real danger lies in your becoming a weak leader through attempting to be a team leader. The "pipeline" chairman, who transmits the faculty will to his administration, does us all a disservice.
2. Remember that only the chairman, not the discipline-oriented faculty, can build a new program and look at the whole department.
3. Find out immediately, as a new chairman, what authority (<u>in practice</u>) the department is willing to give you, and conversely, what degree of autonomy the central administration will grant.

4. Accept the chairmanship in your heart of hearts. Abide by your decision to take it and do not yearn forever for your old life.
5. Do not fall into the trap of over-philosophizing by delegating all the detail work of your department, nor scamp the larger issues by becoming a clerk; without some grasp of detail, even of the "hygiene" of a department, such as making sure there are pieces of chalk and erasers, you soon lose control of all its aspects.
6. Accept advice from your fellow chairmen in other departments. They can be very helpful. Sometimes, even your dean knows what he is talking about. Do not permit a proper pride in your own self-responsibility prevent you from learning from others.
7. Understand that a budget is a plan for an educational program, not a checkbook to be kept by an accountant.
8. Remember that the main job of a chairman is that of recruiting faculty members. Choosing faculty is the one thing in which a chairman must not fail.

In building the faculty, two policies may help. First, decide to build up special interests in your department. Don't try to have senior professors in the whole range of English literature and language, but let strength go to strength. As an aside on the retention problem, if you try to cover the whole waterfront you will naturally find yourself in constant hot water, since every job offer which your faculty members receive will create an emergency, and you will have to go to your dean with the story that you will not be able to give your stated program unless you meet the offer. You will not have "backstoppers" on your staff. Secondly, hire more freely the Ph.D.'s from little-known places such as Kent. You will be helped greatly if a few of the top graduate departments will give the profession the lead in this respect.

Having recruited a staff--that is, having conducted a full-time job in and of itself over the years--how do you retain these people? The main thing to keep in mind is that you can control only the environment of the teaching and research job, not the job itself. And from the job alone, not its environment, comes the professors' rewards.

Those things over which you have control can, unfortunately, do very little in a positive way to keep your faculty happy. Let no one register surprise as I name them. You control a few things, but essentially they are unimportant. They are (1) promotions; (2) salaries; (3) teaching loads; (4) relationships with superiors and peers and inferiors; (5) teaching schedules; (6) tenure. Taken together, these constitute the environment of the faculty member's job. If they are unsuitable or wicked or hateful (or any other adjective), the faculty member will get angry and either leave your department or do a poor job. But unfortunately it does not follow that if they are good, stimulating, excellent (or any other adjective), that he will then be happy and stay with you forever as a productive scholar. Would that life were so simple.

The only aspects of teaching and research which have positive value hide inside the man himself. Or to express it another way, in the job <u>per se</u>: in his interest in teaching and in his interest in research and publication. Above all, positive value lies in his desire to grow intellectually.

It might seem, for example, that if only you could get your teaching load down to a reasonable level and have everyone teach from 9:00 to 10:00 on Monday, Wednesday and Friday only, your problems would be solved. A bad teaching load unfortunately will make a man a poor teacher and a poor scholar, but a good teaching load cannot make him good.

Chairmen despair sometimes because they think it is their position "to keep 'em happy"

so they will do good jobs. Not a bit of it. This is not true even if we assume that cheerfulness and a happy morale are productive. Even that assumption is not necessarily true. Cut-throat and unhappy competition among faculty members may in the long run produce a better department. But for the moment let us assume that we wish a department to have good morale. Still, your job is only to hope to be able to give the man something other than a rotten teaching schedule. Do not go around like the commandant in the Bridge on the River Kwai asking your faculty if they are happy in their work. Too many chairmen believe they must give Jones a light teaching load or he will become unhappy and leave. Or perhaps it is a research grant he wants. Or they feel, I'll wangle a thousand dollars more for Jones, then he will stay and be happy.

By all means, do these things; but do not blame yourself if Jones is ungrateful, unhappy, and if he does in fact leave. You have done your best. You cannot ever give him a positive condition, a positive approach to teaching; all you can do is rid his life of the negative conditions. You cannot make Jones a happy scholar, so don't blame yourself for his failures.

You ask what you should do with your new staff? Find the one thing that the new man can do, and turn him loose on it. It may take some educating of your dean, but don't ask each teacher for everything. We used to feel that a teacher should be pretty good in teaching, in research, in service, in talking to ladies' aid societies, and so on. No longer can we ask all this. We can ask only one competency.

A caution. No sooner have you found the one thing which interests a man, but you should anticipate a change. The man who scorns teaching for six years suddenly finds that it is the classroom he looks forward to. Be ahead of him; cease to expect him to conduct research; have an honors course ready to assign him.

If the day-to-day management tasks are the foundation of the house, and the good faculty the material foundation, the most important job is the building of a sound and vibrant departmental program. Only the chairman can develop a program, for it is a truism that the faculty are concerned with the discipline only. True as this is, I suspect that it must to a degree change if we are to survive as colleges and universities. But more of that later.

The chairman alone builds the program. He only shapes such decisions as whether to teach freshman composition as rhetoric, or as humanities, or as English literature. It is he who decides whether or not to offer a program which is pre-professional--that is to say, pre-graduate school. Or he can decide to offer a major which is in essence a liberal education. It is he only who decides to offer graduate study which is general and prepares teachers for all levels of instruction. Or perhaps he will decide that the department should offer graduate study which is primarily research--a program which prepares teachers to go into one area only of our profession. Will your Ph.D.'s be general literary historians or interpretative critics? Either through day-to-day decisions with a cumulative effect, or through long-range planning, the decisions to a very large extent are the chairman's and not the faculty's.

These are the sorts of questions only you can answer, and having answered them, set the curriculum committees to work. Somehow, I urge, you must also get across to your faculty the notion that it is a part of a college and university. There are distressing indications that English scholars may already have opted out of that position. They talk only to themselves, and create students who follow the same pattern.

Not only has our specialized scholarship isolated us. Some of the most recent national trends in our professional organizations tend in the same direction. Someone in the MLA and NCTE circles nowadays is certain to characterize as "progressive" that department which has dropped freshman composition as a requirement. Don Cameron Allen's report on doctoral study takes a similar stand: let the graduate students study and not teach;

let them get back to what we have been telling the world they are doing--earning the doctorate.

I seem to be a lonely voice on this topic, viewing with alarm the new doctoral proposals which would have the graduate student teach one course in his entire career.

Why alarm? First, without the teaching role, English chairmen will not be able to recruit good graduate students. Our discipline is not like those of Law or Medicine, in which a student is content to put himself through by begging and borrowing from his family. In medicine a student has in the past been content to pay his own way, because of the promise of a high earning power. Since the earning power in English is much lower, we cannot expect our students to pay their own way. (As an aside, it is also clear that medical schools can no longer sustain this image: federal fellowship money is being demanded.)

Second, no dean can cajole from his central administration sufficient money to teach freshman composition with senior professors, no matter how much he may attack <u>you</u> for teaching with graduate students. Nor can he come up with anything like the amount of money needed to support your usual number of graduate students if they don't teach.

In my own case, I estimate that either suggestion would require all the money now reserved for <u>all</u> the faculty additions of the entire college over the next three or four years. No dean can risk so completely the ire of his other departments. One Southwestern department told me that they would need 53 new positions if they were to teach without using graduate students. This is clearly an impossibility if we recognize the facts of life-- for the facts of life are financial not sexual.

Let no one assume that the money, not now available, will pour in soon. The reverse is probably true: in state after state--Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, California--even the most generous, there is every sign that maximum levels of support have been reached and exceeded. Your relative staffing size is probably at its greatest just now. It will grow very little.

Third, and again I am painfully conscious that most of the top-rank people in the profession would not agree with me, I am not persuaded of the virtue of the shorter doctoral program. The fast Ph.D., if it may be called that, is designed to cut down those disgraceful eleven years of preparation which English departments average, and hence to "get people out into the profession." Pray tell me what is the graduate student, now teaching two courses, <u>in</u>? Is he not <u>in</u> the teaching profession? If we could truly change to the fast Ph.D., he would go out all the sooner into the profession of teaching two sections of freshman composition and perhaps one of literature. I consider our teaching fellowship arrangement a pretty good compromise between the duty-free fellowship which is currently an impracticable hope, and the old system of our fathers. In our fathers' days, a man earned one degree in 1905, his second in 1912, and his third in 1922, meanwhile being "out in the profession."

On the fourth point, I consider that no other department in a college is going to take over your job. And I do not really feel that the teaching of composition can be pushed back into the high schools. Therefore, ask to change freshman composition from plain rhetoric to a humanities course or to freshman literature or to freshman English, but don't ask yourself to pretend that writing problems will go away. Heaven knows we are amazed at how poorly students write each September. Somehow over the summer we forget the experience of last year. Writing, I suspect, is always <u>taught</u> and in these days of mass education, at the college level; the English Department must teach it. Neither the high school teacher nor the college history teacher will do the job for you. Unless American society doubles and triples our budgets--which it shows no sign of doing--we must consequently continue to teach with the graduate student.

Already, I merge the present into the overlapping future. For the rest of this talk, let me discuss directly some of your major concerns for the next five years. If I am right, and often I hope I am not, they are greatly different from the traditional considerations of an English Department and its Chairman. Responsive to new dimensions, you will find quite a number of calls on your time which your predecessors did not have.

First, many of you will have the demands of a statewide coordinating board. Second, society's new demands of you, particularly an insistance on evaluation of the English major. As the representative of the USOE will doubtless tell us, an English major must relate to society's needs. Third, student demands for relevancy in the curriculum. Fourth, student demands for vocational training. Fifth, general demands for a more rigorous administration of your department. Taken together, these five will define a new kind of chairmanship.

In the effective past for most of us, colleges and universities have been faculty dominated. This will continue, but probably to a much less marked degree. In the dim past, apparently, colleges were dominated by the administration; but in the not-so-dim future the masters will no longer be the faculty or the central administration (in varying proportions) but society and the student. You can no longer preside over a faculty. You will have to administer it. Some would say, and mean the terms, <u>run your department</u>.

Many of you have already had some experience in the statewide governing boards. Private colleges no doubt will have similar groups to which they must report; for if the operations of the state boards are as successful as would now appear, they will be copied by federated private universities. Where there is no federation, the proven elements of the superboard and its work will be adopted by the separate boards of trustees.

These statewide boards have made crystal clear an historical fact of American education. In the eyes of any other country, the American universities are wedded to the statistical approach. We are far less inner-directed than our European sisters. Even more than in the past, you will not engage in new programs because they are <u>good</u> or because the profession supports them; you will have to justify every program by enrollment figures and by figures derived from the employment market. You will also have to be prepared to spend countless hours developing answers to ten-minute questions. The questions will not be pernicious. But, they will be asked by a good number of agencies, and they will have to be answered.

For society, the courts of law, and the students are all going to demand that you administer your department in a new way. In the past, you reported to the faculty. Principles of equity, academic freedom, and the like, applied primarily if not solely to the faculty.

In a very real sense, the faculty answered to no one but its own conscience. The teacher decided what to teach, when, how, and was sole evaluator of his program. This was a matter of principles and facts--the principles of academic freedom and inquiry, and the facts of tenure and faculty shortage.

What was good for the Universities was good for the country, and only the Universities could decide. If this seems extreme, ask yourself where we have a counterpart to the Flexner report on medical studies.

Now, society is starting to interfere. I don't mean in gross terms such as those we have defeated in the past and will continue to defeat. The legislator will not tell you that so-and-so cannot be hired because he is a communist, or that you can't teach such-and-such a book. We would win any neo-Joe McCarthy battle.

Similarly, the colleges and universities will not long be troubled with the outrageous boycotts and strikes on the part of students. Commandeering administration buildings, locking up vice presidents, and other activities are, like the strong-arm tactics of some politicians, so egregious that in the long run the universities will prevail. There will not be this crude kind of takeover either by the students or by the legislatures.

But we will not be able to win the larger war, which may be called one of attrition. We are going to be treated far more like the public school system than we have in the past. Ask yourselves these questions. Have you or your PTA ever told the local school system that it should begin foreign language study in the third grade, not the ninth? Have you ever felt that the students and the parents should have a voice in deciding who will be principal of the grammar school? How would you face analogous attitudes toward your own department? To the degree that a college education has ceased to be a <u>privilege</u> and has become a <u>right</u>, indeed a near-legal <u>requirement</u> for all young people, society will treat the colleges as it treats the compulsory educational systems of the lower schools.

What have you done when you asked yourself why your Johnny couldn't read? Did you leave it to the school or did you insist upon "interfering"? If the neighborhood principal maintained that he was highly trained in this field, and that you weren't, and hence that you should have nothing to say, what was your reaction? Have you scrutinized your local school? I think very seriously that soon you will not be scrutinizer but "scrutinee," if there is such a word. What would you do if your son reported to you that his eighth grade teacher had not been there for a week and that for only two of the days was there a substitute teacher?

Let us look at just this last illustration. I have, I am sorry to say, a sick professor in my College who suffers from a not-uncommon illness which doubtless needs no specification. He has met only about half of his classes, especially the morning ones, during the whole year. I have kept my fingers crossed and thus far the student complaints have been fielded adequately. I have been permitted to temporarize and we arranged another teaching position for him beginning in September. I believe the best academic traditions were followed and an humane solution arrived at.

In the future, I am very fearful that neither the students nor the general society will permit us this time lag. Student complaints will have to be met immediately. Before I left Kent, I refused to change a failing grade in that class--will I be able to refuse next year? What price, then, Academic Freedom?

As I say, there is going to be a war over our system of higher education, and we will not win that war. We will have to "manage" our departments and colleges in a different way. Your courses will have to be taught so that they give that narrow applicability to present day life which students call relevance. Your literature courses will have to have a specific element of blackness, as Negro contributions to literature are now being called. Your teachers will have to teach in a manner which answers student and parent demands of due process and the rule of reason. And it will not be <u>our</u> traditional rule of reason. It will be theirs.

In the past, if a student complained of a grade he was either ignored or a committee of some kind was formed to review the teacher's grading system. So far as I know, grades were never changed unless the teacher himself not only changed them, but was happy to do so. If as dean I changed a grade today--even if the general faculty agreed that the individual teacher was unjust--there would be such an outcry of outrage against the administration that I would have to resign.

This will change. Committees will no longer back the teacher every time. Impossible examinations will not be tolerated. How you will be able to manage this new kind of administration, I do not know, but it certainly will have to be done. The American professor will have to stand and deliver as he hasn't had to since World War II, and certainly not since Sputnik. As one of my colleagues and yours put it in the hotel

corridors at the last MLA meeting, society is beginning to feel of professors that never have so many been paid so much to do so little for so few.

Let me give a different kind of example, one which illustrates a point of view we simply will not be able to sustain. In the September 1967 AAUP Bulletin, there was a report concerning Adelphi University. The committee which investigated academic freedom at Adelphi in conclusion said such things as this: "We cannot accept. . . the stated expectations of . . . [the Provost of Adelphi]--let me repeat the negative--"We cannot accept the stated expectation that an examination should be a fair representation of what is covered in a course. To apply such criteria. . . would subject some of the best teachers in this country to immediate suspension for 'teaching deficiencies'" (p. 287).

I submit this is nonsense. The frightening thing is that students will soon be taking us to court on this kind of issue. How you as chairmen will survive, squeezed between a faculty strong on academic freedom and a student group strong on the rights of due process, I do not know. I take it, that is, that most American professors share an attitude toward academic freedom, and that the Washington office of the AAUP is a pretty good reflection of that attitude. If they define academic freedom in such a way as to permit such statements as I have just quoted, there will be a head-on confrontation before very long. The legislatures and the students, I am suggesting, are not going to define academic freedom for us, but they are going to say, "Now tell us precisely how the universities do define academic freedom." "Is this kind of statement about Adelphi an accurate one?" they will ask. If so, society will no longer let us be masters of our own house. And we will find that the central administration will side by choice and necessity with the student, and it will be the faculty which becomes the outsider.

How can you cope with this dilemma? I suggest that the only possibility is to attempt to rebuild institutional loyalty, and not just disciplinary loyalty, in the faculty. Get your faculty so proud of your department and so proud of its place in your college, that the individual members will take on more responsibility of their own choice.

Your students will have to be judged as equals in the academic enterprise. You will have to develop a faculty which is prepared to meet their legitimate requests, or at the very least prepared to defend and justify--the harsh verbs are chosen deliberately--what they are doing in their instruction and their research. If the student complains to you that his teacher in a poetry course isn't using the same textbooks as are the teachers in other sections, but has turned "Introduction to Poetry" into a course in King Lear and Measure for Measure, you will have to do something. In short, you will have to administer. In the past, to a very large extent, a chairman did not have to. If his department had any strength at all, he presided over it. The chairman observed that some professor was teaching Shakespeare rather than Introduction to Poetry, only after it had been going on for several semesters; and what he probably did was to give the teacher a different course next time. Such gentility is not going to be enough. Something will have to be done now, while the semester is going on. We used to talk to the teacher who spent all semester on All for Love and didn't quite get to Anthony and Cleopatra; we tried to persuade and cajole, but ultimately academic freedom dictated that this teacher knew best and we could not force him to change. Times have changed and so will we.

The kind of student who is redefining our job is also going to change. It is well-known that employers used to come to American colleges and ask for the pre-professional student. A newspaperman went to the journalism school; the automotive firm went to the engineering college; a business concern went after the marketing major in the College of Business Administration. Increasingly, these employers are coming to the colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences and asking for our graduates. They have found that the marketing student is too narrowly trained and they much prefer our own graduate whom they train in the specifics of their job. Hence, the College of Arts and Sciences, and perhaps especially the English Departments, will be gripped by a paradox.

As this tendency increases in the business and industrial world, we shall have to be more vocationally oriented rather than less. The student will come to Liberal Arts and English because the College of Business Administration is too narrow. On the other hand, the consequence will be that neither he nor society will be content if, upon getting the sheepskin, "he can't do anything." Aggravating the problem is the increasing proportion of students who are in college because they want a degree but haven't the foggiest notion what they are going to do with it. Instead of moaning and groaning about this non-motivated student, we will have to motivate him.

Thus, the English Departments, which already have more roles in the college activity than any other department, will add even more. So far we have had three basic functions: freshman composition, the curriculum for the major who goes on to teach in high school, and the curriculum for the major who goes on to study in graduate school. To the extent that we have been pointing toward quality in our departments, we have become pre-professional through a greater and greater emphasis on the last.

Of course, we have known all along that we have had to serve other students. Now we must become increasingly concerned with the student who wants a major in English, but one which is not pre-professional in leading him toward any kind of teaching. We have always had these students and occasionally we point out to them that all sorts of careers are open to the English major. In the near future we must be more thoughtful and <u>demonstrate</u> to this student the relevance of our courses. Additionally, we will have to address ourselves to the indirect relevance of all our courses. Relevance as electives for anyone. It is an article of faith that we are giving a liberal education, but we will have to document that faith.

As I have indicated, the crucial difference is that as employers and students turn to Arts and Sciences, this liberal education must also be vocational. I don't know the answers to the questions this paradox raises. I'm only bringing a problem to the surface.

In summing up, let me repeat that you will have to administer your departments. You will have to run your department. Chairmen and deans and central administrators have been aware of problems, but in the past we have only discussed them and gingerly walked round and round the issues. Now, in response to pressures from students, from state coordinating boards, from legislatures, from society in general, we will find an insistence that something actually be done. Talk is not enough.

For example:

1. You will have to decide something about the old conflict between teaching and research. Platitudes to the effect that there is no conflict will not suffice. You will have to render judgments, not discuss how difficult it is to evaluate teaching. Students will not let you talk forever; they want action.
2. You will have to find ways of getting a job of work out of a lazy professor who has tenure.
3. You will have to decide precisely how your courses provide a liberal education, and how a liberal education prepares a student for life. Society will no longer simply let you assert that it is so. If you cannot answer the question, society will send the student to a different kind of college, and if one does not exist in your state, the super-board will create one.
4. You will have to accept the principle of accountability as applied to you and your faculty. No other profession than that of academic professors says that society cannot inquire into how well it is doing. The university inquires into how well every other institution is doing, and the tables are going to be turned. As I said earlier, perhaps we will be able to make it stick that only we can judge how well we do our jobs, though I am not sure; in any case, we will be forced to make that judgment. And make it public.

For example, I have seen a study quoted which indicates that our majors in foreign languages cannot speak the language well enough, upon graduation, to order a cup of

coffee in another country. Society is going to demand to know why the hell not. It will also demand to know why our own graduates in English can't read and write better and aren't more liberally and vocationally educated. The truly new thing is that we will have to answer these perennial questions.

This attitude, I think, will mark a major change in colleges and universities and occasion a radical shift in the nature of the chairmanship. It means that we will perforce have to get our faculty to be dedicated to the college and university, or we will not survive. You, I regret to say, will be nickeled and dimed throughout your whole tenure as chairman, assuming that it is another five or six years. Every day you will have a hundred small questions to answer. Of course I could be wrong, and this change really will affect your successor, not you.

You and your professors will certainly have to explain what you are doing, and probably you will have to change. As I've said repeatedly, the academic profession has been about the only one which has neither had to stand and deliver nor hold itself accountable for its conduct. The lawyer has always had another lawyer or a judge standing there ready to say, "You can't do that." And they would make it stick. The professor alone has been able to say to his critic, "You can't judge whether I can do it or not."

A few years ago, for example, typically someone in the dean's office would get an inquiry from the President. It would run something like this: Mr. Jones is a state senator or a member of the board of trustees. He would like to know why his neighbor's son cannot get into a Shakespeare course taught by Professor Smith. The dean would say, "I will look into it and report back as soon as possible." Then I would report that the class is full. I would inquire of the chairman who would inquire of Smith and learn that the seminar had been fully enrolled. That, so far as I and the President were concerned, would be the end of it. We could not force Smith to take another student. This would violate not only academic freedom, but our agreements with Smith about teaching loads. Remember that the next-door state university was always standing by with a permanent offer to Smith anytime that he would accept it.

Obviously we couldn't let Smith go because that would give us a bad name in the profession. The corridors of the MLA would ring with the talk--and we only talked to each other.

Now we will have to hear talk from others, and we will have to answer Jones's questions. "What is your class size? How many are in this class? What is your teaching load?" As a member of the legislature, Jones will not tell us, I am sure, what our teaching load has to be: but we will have to answer these questions and answer them in two or three sentences, not in two or three chapters of a book on academic freedom. Finally, we will have to probably answer Jones's last question, "Why the hell can't a Kent seminar in Shakespeare take more than 15 students? At the hearings on copyright I heard an English Professor say that his seminar had three times that many."

In short, something that we thought was dead may reappear in a new form--the administration-dominated college. Society, the super-board, and the student may force it upon us. There will be an alignment of student and administration against the faculty, not student and faculty against the administration. Faculties, which have developed scorn of administration to a fine art, will suddenly realize that administrations have buffered them from student complaint for their whole professional lives. Students will suddenly realize that the administration has not turned down their petitions from perverse motives but from motives ultimately related to the academic freedom of the faculty. I see a few signs that students are already beginning to realize this and ask for their own academic freedom.

Consequently, I don't envy you your jobs. And yet I do. I have tried to paint an honest picture and I hope I have not painted it too darkly. Indeed, in many of these conjectures

I hope I am wrong. Should you now be wondering why, if I am right, you ever decided to be a chairman, let me emphasize that the rewards of the chairmanship are absolutely enormous. The chairmanship has such possibilities, can be so stimulating, that its rewards are absolutely fascinating. The imagination boggles.

You are not only where the action is, you practically <u>are</u> that action. You are the center, the eye, of the whole storm. At your desk is where life is being made and you have control of its shape. You are personally powerless, that is true, because responsibility and authority always lack power.

But you make things happen. You control the program and the curriculum of the key department in the College and the University. Yours is the largest challenge, the largest reward, of American education. Since it is apparent that in all of American life no activity is going to be bigger and more important than American education, nothing will hold a candle to the chairmanship in English. Deanships? Presidencies? As Mark Twain would say, they aren't even in it. I know you will wield your authority well.

Now in closing, and with apologies both to the Bible and to W.H. Auden, I ask you to join with me in repeating not the Mosaic nor the Hermetic, but the Decanal decalogue:

1. Thou shalt not be farther away than the other end of the telephone.
2. Thou shalt not miss deadlines by more than two weeks.
3. Thou shalt not let fights between professors come to the ears of thy dean.
4. Thou shalt not let thy faculty get out-of-town without turning in final grades.
5. Thou shalt not let the lights and power go out, nor fail to provide parking places.
6. Thou shalt not assign classes at 8, 12, and 5, nor on Saturdays.
7. Thou shalt not covet thy scholars' happiness.
8. Thou shalt not fail to suffer fools gladly.
9. Thou shalt not commit a happiness principle.
10. Thou shalt not despair nor quit.

Lest these seem purely negative, let me remind you that they are all based on positive adjurations. Thou shall love thy job with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind. This is the first and greatest commandment, and the second is like unto it; thou shall love thy faculty and thy students as thyself. On these commandments hang all the Law and the Deans.

ADE BULLETIN of the Association of Departments of English

Chairmen of Departments of English in American Colleges and Universities

Number 19 October 1968

IN THIS ISSUE

© Association of Departments of English, 1968

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Assoc. of Departments of English TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."